It must also be remembered that the temple Vritti has nothing to do with the loan. For these reasons the petitioners request, as will be seen from Mr. C. Anantasami Rao's pencil memo, that this question may be disposed of without being mixed up with the question of loan. This request is reasonable and the matter may also be easily disposed of.

As stated by the Deputy Commissioner, it will not be convenient to hand over one Vritti to the Petitioners for management. The entire Village must continue under Government management till the loan is fully discharged.

The only point to be settled is the amount of Gutta. In this

GPB—5,000—25-9-07

Muzrai 8 A]

Muzrai Secretariat	File No. of 190

matter there is a difference of opinion. The Deputy Commissioner seems to think that Petitioners are Kayamguttadars and that therefore nothing more than Rs 90 should be charged. The view that Petitioners are Khayamguttadars cannot obviously be accepted. Considering the present income from the temple Vritti, Mr. L. Anantasami Naro has said that Rs 150 may fairly be claimed as Gutta. Petitioner M. K. Krishnadas is present and pleads hard in favour of the Deputy Commissioner's recommendation. It seems true that we might split the difference and charge a net sum of Rs 120 as annual Gutta

As the temple Vritti is Rs. 120

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

manner of concern with the loan and as that Vritti has for the convenience of Govt. been taken under Govt. management, it is not thus but fair that the excess of income over the Gutta amount should be refunded to the petitioners. The Deputy Commissioner has calculated the amount to be refunded taking Rs 90 as the Gutta amount subsequent to the expiry of the lease. If my view should be accepted, the amount to be refunded will be Rs 1840-14-7. Of this sum, Rs 617-15-3 are reported to be unadjusted in the Taluk Cutcherry and may at once be paid to the petitioners. Rs 743-3-5 will have to be paid from the funds at the credit of the Temple and Rs 479-11-11 will have to be refunded

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Muzrai Secretariat File No. of 190

for reasons clearly specified in the Deputy Commissioner's letter out of the amount credited toward the loan.

It is very necessary that orders should be issued to the Mram Superintendent to terminate the Settlement.

Ambabhavanji

218
22 9 08
Submitted to the Dewan through the 2nd Commissioner

21 9 08

The Deputy Commrs recommendation to fix the Sutta at Rs 90 per annum may be accepted. This was the amount at which the Chief Commissioner fixed it and it is not ope-

now to change or enhance
if
the Temple Writs may
be ordered to be treated
as Devadaya and the
Inam settlement modified
accordingly
the amount due to the
Petr. for the Temple Writs
may be refunded to him.
The village may continue
to be under the management
of which under the Mortgage loan
is liquidated - as the Temple
& personal Writs are mixed
up and not separated -
The Firman of H H the
Maharaja dated 1830
fixed the Sutta at 31 Varahas

22/9/08

22-9-08

10468
22/9/08

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. | of 190

Subd to the Secretary for perusal of the Dewan's orders.

16/1/08

Secretary
24/1/08

Drafts subd
16/1/08

Approved
16/1/08

Issue.
16/1/08

To The Deputy Commissioners Mysore Dk
" Compt, Mysore Govt
" Revenue Commissioner in Mysore
" Superintendent of Town Settlements

Gr O No 705-8/18-06-10, dated 18th January 1907

Copies orders in terms of the Dewan's orders

Copy to the Financial Branch
No 709/18-06-10, dated 18th Jany 1907

" to the Petrs K Subba Rao and M.K. [illegible]
No 710/18-06-10 dt 18th Jany 1907

File No. of 190 Mizrai Secretariat

Serial No.

From

The Superintendent of Inam Settlemen

no 73 dated 11th March 1909

States that as both Devadaya and Persona
Vrithies are mixed up in the Inam Padavan
Kodu village, Chamarajnagar Taluk,
no separate title deeds can be issued
to the Devadaya and Personal Vrithies

In para 8 of Govt Pro. no 705-8
Inam 18-06-10,
dated 18th January 1909, the Inam Supdt
in the Padavanakodu villa
was requested to treat the Vritti belongin
to the Sri Gowrisatheswaraswami temple
at Konanur in the Nanjangud Taluk as
Devadaya Inam and modify the Inam
Settlement accordingly and also to furnis
this Office with a fresh title deed therefor It
is with ref.ce to that portion of the Govt ord
that the Inam Supdt has made the abov
reply.

Subd with a draft order Recorded?

Ontop fair draft is submd

Fair draft is subd

12/4/09

GPB—50 000—18-5-08



[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

೧೫೦೭ ಕಾಶಿಯಾ

೧೧೨೬ ಪರಮೇ.

೦೧೫೦ ಪೆಂಡಿಮೆ

೧೪೪೧೧ ಪರಮಾತ್ಮ

೨೬೩೦ ಪಲಿಯ

೬೧ ಪಾರಿಮಾ

೬೩೦ ಪಾಲೆಂಗಾಯಿ

೬೪ ಪೆಂಡಿಮಗನು

೬೧ ಪಾಯಸಾನ್ನ

೬೩ ಪಾಯಸದಿಂದ

೬೩ ಪಾಲಾಯದಿಂದ

೨೬೩ ಪೆಂಡಿಯಿಂದ

೧೩೧೪೫೧೧ ಪಾಲಾಯದಿಂದ

೬೬೭೧೧= ಪಾಲು ಪಾಲಾಯ

೬೬೭೫ ಪಾಲು ಪಾಲಾ.

೬೬೩೧= ಪಾಲಿಗಾಯಿ

೬೧೧೪ ಪಾಲೆ ಪಾಲಿಗಾಯಿ

೨೬೦೧೧= ಪಾಲಾಯಿಂದ
ಪಾಲಾಯಿ.

ಒಟ್ಟು ಮೊತ್ತ = ೧೯೯೯೨

ಮುಖಬೆಲೆ = ೧೯೯೯೨

ಕಮಿಷನ್

ಬಿಲ್ಲಿಂಗ್

ಪೋಸ್ಟೇಜ್ = ೧೨೯೨

ಸ್ಟೇಷನರಿ = ೧೨೯೨

ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ

ಪ್ರಯಾಣ

ಗಾಯನ/ಸಂಗೀತ

ಕಲಾವಿದರು = ೧೨೯೨

ಮಾರಾಟಗಾರರು

ಒಟ್ಟು ಕಲಾವಿದರು

ಮಾರಾಟಗಾರರು

ಪ್ರಯಾಣ

ಸಂಗೀತ/ಗಾಯನ = ೧೨೯೨

ಸ್ಟೇಷನರಿ = ೧೨೯೨

ಪೋಸ್ಟೇಜ್

ಬಿಲ್ಲಿಂಗ್

ಕಮಿಷನ್

ಮುಖಬೆಲೆ = ೧೯೯೯೨

ಒಟ್ಟು = ೧೨೯೨

ಕಮಿಷನ್ = ೧೨೯೨

ಬಿಲ್ಲಿಂಗ್

ಪೋಸ್ಟೇಜ್

ಸ್ಟೇಷನರಿ

ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ

ಪ್ರಯಾಣ

ಸಂಗೀತ/ಗಾಯನ

ಕಲಾವಿದರು

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

೬೪

೬೪ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೦॥೧ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೧೩॥೩ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೦॥೩ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೧೦೦ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೨೯ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೬೨ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೨೦೦

೧೦೬೯-೦೦ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೨೬೪ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೨೯೦॥೦ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೬೩॥೦ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೬೨೫೦ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೧೬೯॥೦ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೬೩ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೬೨೫ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

೬೨ ~~ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ~~

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ಮೈಸೂರು ... ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ...

ತಾರೀಖು 25 ಮಾರ್ಚಿ 5 ನೇ ೧೯07ನೇ ಇಸವಿ.

25/3/07

गाथासप्तति

१६॥४०॥ १०६२०

२६८॥= [illegible]

०॥८४॥०६ =॥१२६

१८६॥= [illegible]

[illegible]

१८६ १४८॥=

[illegible] वृत्ति १६

७०६॥. गार्हस्थ्यविज्ञानं [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] वृत्ति

[illegible]

१७४.

१ [illegible]

[illegible] वृत्ति.

[illegible] वृत्ति.

Extract of the Decree Register

(3)

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

This is an extract of
the Thirumana Mundiga obtained
from one Ambala Ananda Pandit
at- Mysore

[illegible]

Extract of the Samaad.



20-9-79

ఆ సంస్థ నిబంధనలను ప్రతిష్ఠ్యం స్థాపించబడింది

శాఖలు వివిధ దిశలలో దేశాలంతటా విస్తరించబడ్డాయి

మొత్తం నిబంధనలు ఆర్థిక సేవలకు సంబంధించిన ప్రతిష్ఠ్యం

యం స్థాపించబడిన దేశాలను బట్టి మారుతూ

ఉన్న కారణంగా వీటిని నిబంధనలు అని

కాకుండా ప్రతిష్ఠ్యం అని పిలుస్తారు

ప్రస్తుతం 19 విభిన్న కారణాల్లో వివిధ రకాల స్థాయిలలో

ఉన్న కారణాల్లో ఇవి ప్రస్తుతం 7 విభిన్న

మొత్తం నిబంధనలు మొత్తం ప్రస్తుతం 7 వివిధ

రకాలుగా ఉన్నాయి. ఇవి ప్రస్తుతం

ఉన్న కారణాల్లో ఇవి

ప్రేక్షకులు అభిప్రాయం అనేది ఒక్కొక్కరిది ఒక్కొక్క విధంగా ఉంటుంది. ఒక్కొక్కరి అభిప్రాయాలు ఒక్కొక్కరకంగా ఉంటాయి. ఒక్కొక్కరి అభిప్రాయాలు ఒక్కొక్కరకంగా ఉంటాయి.

అభిప్రాయం

అభిప్రాయం అనేది ఒక్కొక్కరకంగా ఉంటుంది. ఒక్కొక్కరి అభిప్రాయాలు ఒక్కొక్కరకంగా ఉంటాయి

The above is an extract from a statement which I obtained from one Ambati Ramaiah Panditaradhyulu — The similar document said to have been given to the petitioner's ancestors is not forthcoming —

11-7-07



L Ananthasawm. Rows Esq^r BA.
Muzarai Secretary
in Mysore
Bangalore

3724
12.07

7/2/07

Mem: F 18 The humble petition of the undersigned, members of the late Amelé and Amouta Mahall Bakshi Thippiah, your memorialists

Most Respectfully Shewth:

That your memorialists desire to lay their case before your honour in as few words as possible and to solicit your kind attention thereto and favourable consideration of the same

1. From the enclosed records it will be observed that Servamanega Padanakodu village in the Uyamballi Hobli in Chamarajnagar Taluq, Mysore District which consists of two vrittis, was assigned by the late H. H. Krishnaraja Wodiar Bahadur in 1830 to the members of the Thippiah's family (one vritti) and to the temple of Gowripatheeswara (one vritti) near Konanur, Nanjangud Taluq, Mysore District on the occasion of the grant of the Gowrambudi Agrahar.

2. As the village was not devided into separate recognised vrittis the temple vritti was also from the time of the assignment, under the management of the petitioners ancestors whereby a fixed sum of 31 Varahas (under Chief Commissioners) in return to the temple for [illegible] year to 1880. [vide 10th column of the statement annexed

available in the Inam Superintendents Office
The village was a Bicherak one at the time
when it was granted [vide Inam Settlement
Register of the Padavanakodu village]
3. After the death of Sannuppa - the grandfather
of the Petitioners, then the eldest member of the
family requested the Chief Commissioner either
to take over the management of the temple vritti
from his hands or to confirm the same on him
on Kayam Gutta tenure [vide petition marked A].
In 1879 when the Inam settlement was introduced
into the village in question and on the statement
given by the Inamdars to the effect that they
were enjoying the temple vritti land on payment
of 31 Varal as from the very beginning (under
Chief Commissioners orders) the Inam Commissioner
was kind enough to confirm the same treating
it as one granted for personal benefit.
[vide F. Q. R. No: 38 which is also available in
Inam office]
4. In the year 1880 when the Inamdar represented
to the Deputy Commissioner C. J Pearse Esq^r and
Mr. Perumal the Then Muzamoi Officer, the fact
that they had spent a large sum in building
Kattés and in sinking well in the village and
also that they had advanced a large sum of
money to the ryots during the famine season,
they were kind enough to reduce the Gutta
amount to Rs. 45-0-7 Considering the fact
that the Inamdars had spent a large sum
money in building Kattés and sinking
well in the village and in giving advances
to the ryots

Commissioner ordered the sale of the Gutta of the temple vritti by public auction. At this time Mr. Sannaraw - the petitioners' uncle - protested against this on the ground that the management of the temple vritti was vested in him from the very commencement and that his ancestors had spent a large amount for the improvement of the Bachenahalli village. Then the auction was stopped and the Gutta was again confirmed him for Rs 61+10 Local fund annually. In pursuance of the above order necessary Muchalikas were obtained from local officer 6. Again in the year 1890 a dispute arose regarding the Gutta amount for the purpose of the Kuildar [vide Copy of the proceedings marked B]. The Mamlatdar officer first ordered the sale of the land. The then Deputy Commissioner Mr. J. Meiklejohn considering the claims and the heavy sum of money spent by the members of the family for the temple vritti ordered the cancellation of the sale extending the lease for a further period of 5 years for Rs 61+10 L.F. annually. In a sale proclamation for arrears of Revenue due to Government Mysore Gazette Part II Page 383-84, it is clearly stated that the amount is due from the Kaigani Gutta dues. However some Kaigani village here Kaigani, the village? perhaps the correct spelling of the title Kaigani Gutta dues would be that the Inamdars were Kaigani Gutta dues temple vritti. At any rate a

of this period the Mirasi Chengiala jenny who was the
the Mirasi Officer asked the petitioners father
to execute a bond of lease for a period of
5 years Rs 61-00 annually and also ordered
the payment of the arrears of Rs 52-10-6
in five equal instalments. In pursuance
of the above order Necessary Muchalikas
were obtained from the Local officers
7. In the year 1876 when the Guttu period
was then running on continuously for
Rs 61+10 L.F. one half of the village ie the
vritti of the Inamdar was mortgaged to the
Govt for the loan granted to the members
of the family, but the Temple vritti was not
mortgaged. The Deputy Commissioner of
Malabar District took the management
of the entire village including the temple
vritti which was contrary to the rule
that minor Inams should not be taken under
Govt Management. The petitioners father
made a Takaran to the effect that the whole
village should not have been taken under
Govt management as he was to pay an
Guttadan per year Rs 61+10. L.F annually
to the Temple But before the Takaran could
be disposed of one way or the other he
died leaving behind him minor Sons.
No action seems to have been taken in
the matter till 1906 when the members of the
family were called upon to assist in the
adjustment of accounts. Your humble
petitioners presented themselves before the
Assistant Commissioner and on perusal
of the records found

deprived of the possession of the temple vritti debiting the income from the temple vritti to the temple accounts instead of giving it to the surviving members of the petitioners' father.

8 It will be seen from the above the temple vritti has been under the management of the petitioners' family almost from the year 1830 and their right of the enjoyment of the proceeds of the temple vritti after paying a gutta amount to the temple was never questioned till 1901-02. Your humble memorialists pray that the vritti may kindly be conferred on them on Kayamgutka tenure of 31 Varahas refunding the amount to them held in deposit in the temples' name as per list herein enclosed.

9. The withholding of the amount which should properly accrue to your memorialists with a view to benefit the temple is opposed to all principles of justice and your memorialists humbly pray that their case may be taken into favorable consideration as they have been reduced to the very poor and indigent circumstances and as they have no resources to fall back upon except the income they get from the [illegible] which unhappily have been mortgaged to the Govt in satisfaction of the loan already referred

For this act of Kindness your memorialists will ever pray for your long life and pro

The following papers are herewith annexed for your perusal

1. A copy of the order granting the of the temple vritti for 10 years in 1870

2 The order of the Muzarai officer Mysore vide dated 10.1.1885.

3 The authenticated extract copy of the "from Register" of Nanjangud dated 28.2.1885.

4. Do extract copy of "to Register" of Nanjangud dated 4.7.1888

5. Do true copy of the Deputy Commissioner dated 26.7.1890

6 The Mysore Gazette Part II pages 383-84 dated 13-6-1891

7. The original order of the Muzarai Officer, no 172 dated 22.8.1890

8 The original petition presented by the Inamdar dated 15.1.1885 with Amildar's endorsement thereon

9 The original copy of the petition presented by the petitioners' father dated 24.11.1897

10 Do 19.1.1898

11. Copy of the Muchalika executed by the Inamdar's father in 18.2.1895

12. An unauthenticated copy of the Govt proceedings no. 21-45-6 (1638 7) which was found among the records of the petitioners' ancestors.

13. A detail statement of the account

K. Sundara Rao
6.2.1907

Sri. K. Krishnarao
1992 Krishnavilas, Mysore

Muz. 1 A Judicial F 18-06-2

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

190 —190

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B. A.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Dy Commr
Mysore Dt

Dated 6th Feb 07

Despatched

Received

General No. 3724/16
Muzrai F. No. 1

Enclosure No. 13

Has the honor to forward herewith Petn Regd No 3724 dy 7th Feb. 1907 together with its thirteen enclosures, received from K.S. Subbarao and M. K Krishnarao, praying that the Vritti endowed to the Sri Gowripateswaraswami at Konanur in the Nanjangud

GPB—3 000—2.7 06

Taluk, which has contended in their possession & enjoyment upon payment of a fixed annual amount to the temple, may be confirmed to them.

2. The Dy Comm^r is requested to enquire into the matter and submit a detailed report on the allegations of the Petrs. The entire records relating to the subject on which the Petrs have their claim should also be forwarded along with the report.

By order

13/2/07

Secy to Govt

9-2-07

End: to Petn

By order

13/2/07 Secy to Govt

Judy Jr 18-06-3

~~189~~ 1906-07

From

Dr Kanakaraj Avo Esq B A
Deputy Commissioner

To Bijapur District—
L. Anantā vammi Rao Esq B.A
Secretary to Govern ment
Judicial Dept

Dated

Despatched 10th April 1907

Received

General No. 413

No.

Enclosure No. 1 file + 1 plan
with 13 Encls.

Submits report on the petition of K. S. Subba Rao and M. K. Krishna Rao re the Vrittis endowed to the Sri Gurudeva paduvaravara Swami temple at Konanur in the Navilgund Taluk.

4641

Referred for opinion

Dt 15 Mar 07

Endorsed Office note

Orders

Dt 9-4-07

4/3
1 file + 1 letter with
13 Enclos

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Dated Mysore 10th April 07

Anantasawmi Rao Esq. B.A.
[illegible]
Revenue Department.

Sir,

I [illegible] docket No.
3967 dated 17th [illegible] 1907
[illegible] petition
Registered [illegible] dated 7th [illegible]
1907 [illegible] 13 enclosures
(thereto [illegible]) [illegible]
K. S. Subba Rao and M. K. [illegible]
Rao, [illegible] I [illegible] endorsed
to the Sri Gowrishankara Swami
[illegible] Hobli [illegible] Malavalli Taluk,
which [illegible] to possession
and enjoyment of [illegible]
[illegible] Medlys for the part
[illegible] and [illegible] of a fixed
annual amount to the [illegible] may
be confirmed to them, I have the
honour to [illegible] as follows —

2. Padmanabha Kodur Hosahally
village is a [illegible] village
in the Channapatna Taluk.
It consists of two Hoblies. Under
Sanad dated 1830, this Sarvamanya
village

village was granted by H. H. the late Maharaja Sri Krishnaraja Wadayar Bahadur III to the petitio-ers' grand father (Venkatesiah) one Vritti being granted to Ven-Kateshiah and the other for the benefit of the Gowripatheswara Swami temple at Konanur in the Nanjangud Taluk. The village which was once in a flourishing condition became Bechirakh subsequent to the famine of '876-77 and the petitioners' ancestors appear to have been, as per orders of the late Chief Commissioner paying a fixed Gutta of 31 Varahas to the temple, which was subsequently changed to Rs 61+10 (Loc. cess) annually. From the records hereunto submitted, it is understood that the management of the village including the temple Vritti was uninterruptedly vested in the Inamdar, to whom the Gutta was leased out for specific periods from time to time on payment of a fixed annual amount to the temple in question viz Rs 61+10. The last lessee who held the lease

for

for a period of 5 years from 1895 to 1900 at Rs 61/- per annum appears to be the petitioners' father Krishnappa. After the expiry of this last lease, the management of the whole village was resumed by Government under the Deputy Commissioner's order No. 44 dated 10.8.99 but from the Ranjangud Taluk Amildar's report the village seems to have been actually taken under Government management in the year 1897 in connection with a family loan obtained by the petitioners' ancestors from Government in the year 1896.

3. The Survey Settlement was introduced into the village in 1899 and the then Mysore Secretary (Mr. A. Srinivasa Charlu) while forwarding the petition of Mr. Ambole Anniah Pandit requesting that the temple's share be ordered to be separated from the Inamdar's (Vide Rubakari No. 666 dated 13.11.97) directed that necessary action should be taken in the matter of Mr. Ambole Anniah Pandit's request. The Deputy Commissioner thereon

thereon ordered that the temple's share should be separated and numbered. Some correspondence ensued thereon and the Deputy Commissioner in his order No. 79 dated 4.1.98 directed that the temple's share should be separated soon after the Survey Settlement. In pursuance of the above order the Amildar reported that the accounts of the village had been prepared in accordance with the settlement and after dividing the whole village into two parts submitted two statements shewing the Survey numbers to be included in each division together with the Survey map duly marked in red ink and solicited orders as to which share should be taken for the temple.

4. In his order No 162 dated $\frac{23}{25}$.5-1900 the Deputy Commissioner enquired what the Inamdars had to say regarding the division of the village and directed that the intention

of

of the Inamyadars should be obtained in writing.

5. Thereupon the Inamyadar was written to and Mr. Samoo Rao, Mokhtesar of the Chamundi Thotti in the Mysore Palace (Petitioners' uncle) protested against the division and requested that as heretofore and in pursuance of the late chief Commissioner's order, the Khayamgutta amount should be taken from him and the temple Vrithi left in his possession.

The chief Commissioner's order referred to by Mr. Samoo Rao appears to have been presented to the then Amildar-in-charge officer in January 1885 but how the paper was disposed of could not be traced out.

6. The petitioners now request

(i) That the temple Vrithi may be confirmed to them on a Khayam gutta tenure of 31 Varahas annually as per late chief Commissioner's order No: 69 dated 1860.

(ii) That the temple Vrithi amount credited towards the family loan from the Year 1896 to 1901 be ordered to be refunded

refunded to them and

(iii) That the Vrithi amount credited to the temple funds from the year 1902 upto date be ordered to be refunded to them after deduction the annual Kharyamgutt amount at Rs 71/- which is being paid by their ancestors from the year 1885.

7. Regarding the 1st prayer, the Amildar of the Ranjangud Taluk reports that the petitioners prayer deserves consideration as the petitioners ancestors had all along been in the possession and enjoyment of the temple Vrithi from the year 1830 upto 1900 on payment of a fixed Gutta to the temple, ranging from 31 Varahas to Rs 61+10 (Local Fund) annually.

8. As regards the 2nd prayer of the petitioners the Amildar states that if the temple Vrithi amount from 1896 to 1901 as alleged by the petitioners has been credited towards the paid loan, the petitioners will be entitled to a sum of Rs 779-12-0 as detailed on page 9 of the Amildar's report as per terms of

of the lease.

9. In respect of the 3rd prayer, I beg to state that if Government be pleased to grant the 1st prayer of the petitioners, they will fairly be entitled to the amount credited to the temple funds from 1902 after deducting the gutta amount due to the temple.

10. A reference to the Quit Rent Register shews that the Inam has been treated as personal and is enfranchised. From the copy of the statement given by the petitioners uncle (Mr. Sannoo Rao) it is understood that at the time of the Inam Settlement the Vrittis were not divided and under orders of the Chief Commissioner the village was being enjoyed by the petitioners' ancestors on payment of a fixed amount to the temple viz: 31 Varahas. This has been duly confirmed by the Settlement officer (Mr. B. Rajugopaliah) on 20.9.1879. In a Sale notification of the Sarvamanya village in question (Vide Mysore Gazette pages 383-384 Part-II of 13th June 1891, printed

printed copy of which is filed with the records) the Vritti dars are mentioned as Khayam gutta dars. The village being a Sarvamanya village it should be presumed that the defaulters (the petitioners ancestors) were the Khayam-gutta dars in respect of the temple Vritti alone.

11. From a copy of the late Deputy Commissioners' (Mr. Meikle John's) order filed with the records it may be seen that Krishnappa (the petitioners father) held the temple land as a tenant of the Superior holder and that the Gowri pattheswara Swami temple could only recover its dues by proceeding under section 97 of the Land Revenue Code or by proceeding in the Civil Courts. The Deputy Commissioner has moreover remarked that the Amzai officer had no power to order the sale of the land which from its commencement was illegal and void.

12. One of the petitioners (Krishna Rao states)

states that when his father Krishnappa died i.e. in 1899 they were minors and it was only in 1906 when he (Krishna Rao) was called upon to assist the adjustment of the loan account that he came to know that the temple Vrithi amount had been credited to the temple funds and that the other members of the family had no interest in the affair as per Partition Deed executed in 1885 the Vrithi of the village in question came to the share of the petitioners father (Krishnappa).

13. The Amildar of the Nanjan-gud Taluk to whom the petition under reply was referred to for enquiry and report has submitted a clear elaborate and detailed report on the subject and for reasons stated in the Amildar's report as well as those referred to above, I am of opinion that the petitioners prayers deserve favourable consideration

14. The file of vernacular papers, as per Appendix bearing on the subject and ending with the Nanjangud Taluk

Taluk Amildar's report No. 325/469 dated 24. 3. 1907 is herewith submitted for reference.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient Servant

W.

Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

B.A.

No. 5405 D/18.5.07

Dated the 18-05-4

The Superintendent

of Census Settlements

in Mysore

Has the honour to

request that an extract

of the detailed Census

Register pertaining to

the Devadurga village

in the Lingsugur Taluk

village in the Chinnaraja-

-nagara Taluk, endowed

by the Govindapathaswamy-ll

-swamy temple at-

Kannamur in the aforesaid

Taluk, may be kindly

forwarded for inquiries.

8/5/07

8/5/07

No. 5406 / 18.5.07 — 2 Pgs

To Indoor P. 16 - 1 -

The Secretary to Govt

Land & Rev Depts

Sir,

In connection with a Vritti endowed to the Sri Gowripathiswara Swami Temple at Kovvuru in the Nandigama Taluk, the papers noted in the margin were required for reference

The Vritti is in the Kurumaraya Gudimanukonda Household village in the Chinna-Ganjamangam Taluk-

I am to request the

(1) Proceedings of the Board of Revenue No. 1. dated 18 Jan 1820

(1) Chief Comm's order No 92 dated 9 Jan 1861 forwarding the Accounts of the Vritti for 1859-60

favour of your kind
sending the enclosed
papers at your early
convenience.

I have &c

Obt-

8/5/07

Ks
8/5/07

5403

18.26

Please see
& furnish
report

Etc

2. [illegible]

3. [illegible]

By order

[illegible]

For Secretary.

Compd
28-5-07

MYSORE CON...
5505

5/6/07

R 1

Record 1906-907

From The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysor

To The Secretary to the Gove-ment of Mysore,

Dated 31st } Inam Departmen
Despatched }
Received 1st June } May 1907.

General No.
No. 126

Enclosure No.

With reference to his docket No. 5405 dated 18th May 1907 requesting to be furnished with a copy of the Inam Register pertaining to the gra of a vritti in Padavanakon village to Sri Gowri Pathes-wara swami temple at Konamur, has the honor to state that in the Padavana-Kodu village, there is no Inam to the Devaru under refer ence but there is one to Sri Gowri Patheswaraswami at Go-ramba Agrahar nea Padavanakodu.

Supt of Inams in Mys

N 6/4/08

Issue above
6/11/08

75 13

Mysore 18-06-8

Read :-

Petn Rec'd no 3724
8th Feb: 08 from K.S
Subba Rao and M. K
Krishna Rao, praying
that the Vritti endowed
to the Sri Sowmyakeswara
Swami temple at Konanur
in the Nanjangud Taluk
which has continued in
their possession & enjoyment
upon their paying a
fixed annual Sum to
the temple may be
confirmed to them

Le Hearing

10th April 1907 from the

Dy Commr, Chyd on District

Reporting on the above.

Yadasht no 230 Dy

28th May 1907 from the

Secretary to Govt, Genl &

Rev. Dept stating that

neither the Samvad of 1830

granting the Inam to the

temple nor the late Chief

Commrs order no 92 of 1861

fixing the lease amount

of 31 Varahan, is forthcoming.

Docket no 129 Dy

1st June 1907 from the

Superintendent of Inam

Le Mesnen de in - Ug 3 ore
stating that there is
no Iraan b the temple
in the Padavana kadu
village but that there
is one Sri Gowrisa theswara
Gurukul at Gowraam bee
Agraharam near Padavanakadu.

---

20 4357-60 D (Order thereon:—
6th April 1908
Encl one file
d 4361.

The facts of the
case are as follows:

Sri Mahanta the late
Vinayaga Krishna Raja
Mudiyar Bahadur III Granted
21 Vatties in connection
with the Gowraamba

and the Sri Gowri pa Iswaraswamy
Temple which he established
in 1830. Out of these one
of the was given to Venkatesiah
grand father of the petitioners
and one to the Temple
above named. These two
brothers formed the Village
of Padavanakodu
and the donee was in the
enjoyment of both the
of them, paying one
account to the temple's
Shine, a putta of 31 Varahas
per annum after deduction

the Writs on Establishment
charges, such as Postage &c.
This continued up to the
year 1860, when up on
offers of higher Duties being
made by others, on account
of the temple Writs, the
Master went up to the
Commissioners' Surgeon,
and it was decided that
in consideration of Mr Kaye's
long enjoyment & the
improvements & offices &c in
& the Writs by him, the
Lease since 23

in the hands of Venkatesachi
yanig for a period of
10 years on payment of
the former annual Gutta.

2. Subsequently, the
Village having become
Poshnia as a result
of the famine of 1876-7
and afterwards having
been restored to a certain extent to its former
size, the Inamdar made prayer
for a reduction in the
Gutta amount. The Gutta
was accordingly reduced

& Rs 45 per annum.

Again in 1885, the condition of the village having improved the fixed was revised & Rs 61 plus Rs 10 for local & other cesses for a period of 10 years. In 1895, the lease was again extended by 5 years on the former terms & the same lease. Before the expiry of this last lease, the lease was again renewed (for then the Ryot died), and the Survey Settlement was introduced

in 1879.

2. About the time

of drawing the Comet,

Mr. Pundit Jeevanji Pandit

of Khaire petitioned Govt.

and recommended that

that portion of Mughal

be taken to define the portion

belonging to the temple

& arrange that the whole

of the income may be utilized

for the benefit of the temple.

The petition was sent to the

Dy Comm & by the late Mujeeb

Superintendent for needful action

4. The village was divided into 2 parts by the former Deputy and the present Sarpanch was asked if he would agree to the division. He did not agree & represented that the village should remain without division as before & that the temple which should be subjected only to the former - Jun Ka of Rs. 61-10. - No further action appears to have been taken on representation from

5. The members of the
Lessee's family obtained in
1896 a loan from Govt
for the liquidation of
their family debts &
mortgaged to Govt the lands
belonging to them. In
arranging this, the personal
Entries contained in the
Padmanabhapuram village
was alone mortgaged
& not the one belonging to
the temple. Notwithstanding
this, the Deputy Commr took
possession of the whole village

including the temple with
and director that the income
of the whole village, do not
the cost of repairs should
should be credited town
repayment of the loan
This mistake was subsequently
rectified & the income of
the temple with is being
credited to the temple
during the past four years

S. The letters also
are the source of the local
source information no
representation that the same
which was

brought to an end may
be received & given to them
on the former sum of Rs 61410.
and that the savings
accruing out of the loan to
should be given to them.
They found their long enjoyment
& state that the savings
credited to the temple
during the last few years
& those credited to Govt.
on account of the loan
may be refunded to them.
6: The Govt observe
that it is not known
how & upon what conditions

the Management of the
temple with came under
the original banner banner.
Neither the late Maharaja
Sawai of 1830 nor the
late Chief Commi
order of 1861 [illegible] the
[illegible] is for the [illegible]. The
[illegible] the [illegible]
[illegible] of the Sikhs. The
there is no [illegible]
temple [illegible]
in the Vedic [illegible]
village [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] of opinion

~~direct~~ [illegible] that the writer

has intended

[illegible] for the benefit

of the people and therefore

should not be the object

for [illegible]

the temple, it maybe desirable

of the people from the time

of the present, [illegible]

it desirable to leave the management in their hands on such terms as may be settled upon between the Bristol owners & the Petr. after the discharge of the loan obtained from Govt. thereof he will direct his Solr. to report

(1) what the present income from the Temple Bristol is

(2) and what would be the reasonable sum that should be paid thereafter by the Petr., (3) what will be the exact amount of arrears

to them after deducting
the amount of the Gutter
to be fixed hereafter.
Next, as regards the prayer
of the Petn that the savings
of the temple with credited
towards the loan being
refunded to them, the Commr
is requested to report whether
the whole of the income
of the temple with has been
taken up for the loan
or whether the usual Gutta
amount of Rs 61+10 has been
credited to the temple.
A clear report as to how

the income relating to the
loan transaction has
been credited till now
should be subject to
Income Tax decide
how much has to be
credited to the Temple
& how much of any loan has to be
refunded to the Govt.

Issue at once

Govt Orders

6/4/08

Govt Notification

5/4/08

To,
The Secretary
Mylapore Municipality Revenue records.
" Comptroller Madras
" Superintendent of Census Madras
" Accountant General, Simla & Madras.

No 1361 Copy of the Govt. in Revenue to the



Refers

SA

Please submit time limit for Lease

W. 4/6/08

Misc F 18-06-9

1907-08

From

M. Kantaraj Urs, Esq., BA

Dy. Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

L. Ananta Sawmi Rao, Esq., BA

Secy. to the Govt. of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, ~~Gen. & Rev.~~ Depts.

Dated 1st June 1908

Despatched

Received

General No. 529

No.

Enclosure No. 1 & 1 file

Subject.

Submits further report re Vritti endowed to the Sri Gowribalu-vana Swami temple at Konanur in the Nanjangud Taluk

No. 529
Enc. No. 1 & 1 file

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commissioner
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore Camp 1st/2nd June 1908.

To

D. Anantharam Rao Esq., B.A.
SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
~~GENERAL AND REVENUE~~ mukroi DEPARTMENTS.

SIR,

According to Government Proceedings No. 4357-60 dated 6th April 1908 calling for further report regarding the praya of M.K. Subbarao and M.K. Krishna Rao in the matter of the Vritti endowed to the Sri Gowri Patheswara Swami temple at Konanur in the Nanjangud Taluk, I have the honor to state as follows:-

2. The present average annual income from the Padakadu Hosahalli Village in the Chamarajnagar Taluk after the introduction of the Survey Settlement in the year 1899-1900 is Rs 729-10-10 or Rs 730 in round numbers.

3. After deducting the marginally noted items of expenditure, the net income of the Village is Rs 625/-. As half of this amount

1 Local Fund payable to Government 41-4-
2 Patigi payable to Shanbhogs & Patels 61-10-
3 Mari Kodaji Kandayam 2-2-
105-0-

amount has to go to the temple's share, the present annual income to the temple is $\frac{625}{2}$ or Rs 312-8-0

4. As stated in para 4 of the Government Proceedings under reply ~~(para 4)~~ the Village was not divided into 2 parts by the Survey department, but the local authorities made the division with a view to demarcate the temple Vrithi separate from the personal Vrithi of the Inamdar. Mr. Samnoo Rao on behalf of the lessee Krishnappa (petitioners' father) did not agree to the proposal and represented that the Village should continue without division as before and that the temple Vrithi should be subjected to only the former Jutta of Rs 61+10 - No further action seems to have transpired thereon.

5. The Government having decided that the future management of the temple Vrithi should rest with the Inamdars, the question

question that has to be decided is one, what terms the Vrithi should be made over to them. In consideration of the long enjoyment of the Vrithies by the the petitioners' ancestors and the improvements effected by them to the village, as ordered by His Highness the late Maharaja Sri Krishnaraj Wodeyar Bahadur III, the gutta payable by the Inamdar was, under orders of the late Chief Commissioner in 1860, fixed at 31 Varahas. This was also confirmed at the Inam Settlement in the year 1879. As already recommended in my letter No. 413 of the 10th April 1907, the same amount viz 31 Varahas or Rs 90-0-0 per annum would as recommended by the Amildar in the accompanying report No. 337/602 of 8.5.1908 be the reasonable Kayamgutta to be paid by the petitioners from 1900-1901 ie the year from which the previous lease had expired.

6. As regards the exact amount of arrears to

to be paid to the petitioners I beg to st as follows:-

The total receipts from the Village question from the year 1896-97 to 1906 inclusive as per accounts maintain in this Office amount to Rs 7072-6-1 and the expenditure during the same period on account of Patigi &c to th Village servants is Rs 1138-5-4 leaving balance of Rs 5934-1-7 which shoul have been distributed in equal shar between the personal and Temple Vrit But the amounts actually adjusted towards the loan and credited to the temple up to the end of the year 1906 come to Rs 3446-12-11 (or Rs 479-11-11) in ex- cess of the income of the Personal Vrithi and Rs 1869-5-5 (or Rs 1097-11-2 less) res pectively.

(2) A sum of Rs 617-15-3 is reported by the Amildar of the Chamaraj nagar Taluk to be remaining unadjusted in the Taluk.

(3) The sums of Rs 479-11-11 + 617-15-3 or Rs 1097-11-2 have therefore to be cre- dited to the Temple Funds.

(4) It will therefore be seen that

income towards the temple Vrithi from 1896-97 to the end of 1906-1907 is Rs 2967-0-7.

(5) The amount of Kayamgutta payable by the Inamdar is as stated below:-

Rs 286-2-a at Rs 71-8-6 per annum for 4 years from 1896-97 to 1899-1900 the period during which the former lease ran, and

Rs 630-a-a for 7 years from 1900-01 to 1906-07 at 31 Varahas or Rs 90 per annum.

Rs 916-a-a

Deducting therefore Rs 286-2-a + 630-a-a or Rs 916-a-a, the amount payable as Kayamgutta by the petitioners, from the total income of the temple Vrithi viz 2967-a-7 the petitioners are entitled to the refund of Rs 2050-14-7 up to the end of 1906-1907.

7. In para 7 of the Government Proceedings under adverted to, it is observed that it may be desirable to leave the management in the hands of the petitioners on such terms as may be settled upon hereafter when the Vrithi

Vrithi reverts to the petitioners after the discharge of the loan obtained from Government.

8. In this connection, I beg to submit that the personal Vrithi alone has been mortgaged to Government on account of the loan obtained by the petitioners from Government, and that the temple Vrithi has nothing to do with the loan. However as the two Vrithies have not been separated it is now difficult to separate the one from the other, so as to give the management of the temple Vrithi alone to the petitioners, retaining the other under the management of Government as security for the loan. I would therefore recommend for the sake of convenience that the entire Village be managed by Government till the discharge of the loan the accounts relating to the two

Vrithies

Vrithies being kept separate and adjusted asabove.

(5, 9. In this connection I wish to bring to the notice of Government one serious consequence of the order of the Inam Settlement Officer. The Vrithi granted to the temple has been enfranchised along with the personal Vrithi which is fundamentally opposed to the terms of the grant of the Vrithi as Inam and is therefore suicidal to the interest of the temple. I would therefore request that this defect may be rectified, the temple Vrithi being declared as Swadaya and treated as inalienable.

10 A statement showing the receipts, expenditure and amounts adjusted towards the loan and the temple Vrithi is herewith submitted for reference.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

B.A.

dwg I= 18-06-10

File No. 18-06

Serial No. 10

Diary No. of letter replied to.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

( )

, the 190

Date of issue 18.1.1909.

Signed by Mr. A. S. Iyer

READ—

--- Govt Pro No 4357-60 dated 4th April 1908 observing that the Devadaya vritti in the Padavana Kodu village endowed to the Sri Gowripateswaraswamy temple at Konanur in the

ORDER THEREON.—No.

Nanjangud Taluk, may be restored to the management of the petitioners K Subba Rao and M K Krishna Rao on such terms as may be settled upon after the discharge of the loan vide

SUBJECT

from Government by the
petitioner's family, and
calling for further information
in the matter from the Dist. Magistrate Dist.

Letter No 529 dated 18th
June 1908 from the Deputy
Commissioner, Mysore District.
(in extenso)

Order thereon No 705-8 / 18-6-10. R/18.1.09
Received

The village of Padavanadodu
in the Chamarajanagar
Taluk is formed of 2 vrittis-
one being a personal inam
granted to Venkatesiah,
grand father of the petitioners,
and the other a Devadaya
inam endowed to the Sri
Channigaraya Swamy
Temple at Kowdahalli in the
Chamarajnagar Taluk Venkatesiah
was managing the entire
village paying a gutta of
~~Rs~~ 31 Varahas to the temple as fixed in the Sr
No lease to thimmaiah of the temple of H H the late
Maharaja Sri Krish

R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

Vritti was from time to time renewed by Govt Officers and for small sums on account of famine and other causes. The last occasion was in 1895 when the lease was renewed for a period of 5 years at an annual patta of Rs 71 and odds.

2 The petitioner's ancestor ~~contracted~~ obtained a loan from Government, and mortgaged their personal vritti in this village as security therefor. As the vrittis had not been separately demarcated and as Venkatesiah's family is in the possession of the entire village the Deputy Commissioner on behalf of Government assumed the management of the entire village in the year 1896.

3 Petitioners, who are then minors now request that the temple vritti may be restored.

them on lease for an
annual gutta of Rs 7/1
and that the income
there of which has been
credited to the temple
may be refunded to them
after deducting this gutta
4 The Deputy Commissioner
reports that the prittee
are not separated from
each other and that it
is therefore difficult to
restore the management
of the temple vritti alone
to the petitioners and
recommends for the sake
of convenience both the
prittee may continue to be
managed by Govt till
the loan is discharged
under the circumstance
reported that the Dy
Commrs recommendation
is approved
5. As regards the annual
gutta the Deputy Commr
is of opinion that the
lease having been renewed
for five years from 1895
at an annual rent of
Rs 7/1- and adds that rate
should be adhered to till

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation Sheet draft form.)

the expiry of that lease.
For subsequent years the Dy Commissioner recommends that the sum of 31 Varahas which has been fixed by the Chief Commissioner in 1860 and confirmed by the Govt Dept in 1879 may reasonable be claimed as quitta. Govt concur in the views of the Dy Comm[r] and fix the rent from 1900-1901 and onwards at Rs 90/- per annum permanently, the lessees who are the petitioners bearing all the expenses connected with the Temple.

The petitioners also request that they may be paid the arrears of the balance of the income from the temple with credited towards the loan and the Temple funds from the year 1896-97 and not paid to them ever since the villages were taken under Government management.

With reference to the lease which has been granted to them in perpetuity as long as they fulfil the conditions of the grant

Regarded to the refund the Dy Comm[r] reports that the nett

MGCPB—30,000—5-4 (

the pattis from 1896-97
up to 1906-7 is Rs 5,934-1-17,
that a moiety there of viz.
Rs 2967-0-10 only is adjustable
towards the loan and that
out of the other half a sum
of Rs 916-2-0 has to be credited
to the temple account and
the balance of Rs 2050-14-9
refunded to the petitioners.
He however states that actually
Rs 3416-12-11 have been
credited towards the loan
and Rs 1869-5-5 in favour
of the temple and that a
sum of Rs 617-15-3 remains
unadjusted in the
Thanjavur Taluk
Kacheri.

87. In the foregoing circumstances, the refund
of the sum of Rs 2050-14-9
to the petitioners is sanctioned,
the charge being met as
follows:—

Rs 617-15-3 being the amount
reported to be
remaining unadjusted
in the Thanjavur
Taluk Treasury
to be paid by the

GENERAL AND REVENUE
SECRETARIAT

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

Deputy Commissioner
Rs 1479-12-1 being the amount
credited in excess
towards the loan
to be paid by the
Comptroller in the
usual course
Rs 953-3-5 from the Savings
of the Sri Gowri
Pateswara Swami
Total Rs 2050-11-9 temple.

The Deputy Commissioner will in future pay the balance of the income from the temple vritti to the petitioners after deducting the gutta and other charges.

S/ The Superintendent of Inam Settlements is requested to treat the temple vritti as Devadaya inam and modify the Inam Settlement accordingly and also furnish this Office with a fresh Title Deed therefor at an early date

10/4/09

Dewan's order,
Dft

for Secretary

To,

The Dy Commr Mysore Dt

returning records

" " Comptr Mysore Govt

" " Revenue Commissioner

" " Superintendent of Inam

Settlements in Mysore C.No. 709
18-06-10.

Copy to Financial Branch

" to the petitioners K. Subba Rao 710
and M. K. Krishna - &c., 18-06-10

From

Secy. to the Govt of His Highness
The Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl. and Rev. Dept.

To

The Comptroller,
Mysore Govt

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

ENCLOSURE NO.

Para 7 of Govt Pro No 705-8 dated 18th ~~December~~ April 1908

In continuation of the above has the honor to forward herewith a bill for Rs 953-3-5, being the amount sanctioned to be paid to K Subba Rao and M.K. Krishna Rao from the savings of the Sri Gowripateswaraswami temple at Konanur, Nanjangud Taluk, and to request that a Rs. may be credited to ...

G.P.B.—10,000—9-1-06.

forwarded

~~to this office for transmission to~~

the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore Dt.,

for payment to the parties concerned.

By order,

8
15.1.09

No 718 Draft
18-11-11

for Secretary.

27/1/08

Copy to the Deputy Commr., Mysore Dt.,

for information in contn. of Govt. No. M/105-DD 18.1.09.
18-06-10

By order,

8
15.1.09

for Secretary.

27/1/08

Muz 19]

MYSORE MUZRAJ DEPARTMENT.

The Government of Mysore ..... Dr

Particulars	Amount	Remarks
Amount payable to K. Sabba Rao and M.K. Krishna Rao as from the savings available at the credit of the Sri Gowripateswaraswami temple at Konanur, Nanjangud taluk —	953 3 5	Vide Govt Pro: No. 705-87/Muz 18-06-10 dated 18th ~~December 1908~~ Janry 09.

Rupees Nine Hundred and Fifty three, annas three and pies five —

[Payable in the Mysore Dt Treasury]

By Order,

Dft)

for Secretary

GPB—100—2-10-07

VII 415 b

D/1010 A

1906 to 1909 ff 18-06

—12

From

The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore, General & Revenue Departments

Dated 11th
Despatched 12 } March 1909.
Received

General No. 73
No. 1.

Enclosure No.

States that as both Devadaya and Personal Vrittis are mixed up in the Inam Padavanakoon Village, Chamarajanagar Taluk, no separate title-deeds can be issued to the Devadaya and personal Vrittis

Reply

SA

10/8/09

MY

Inam Superintendent's Office

No. 73. Dated, Bangalore, 11th/12 March 1909

From

The Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, General and Revenue
Departments

Sir,

With reference to para 8 of Govern-
-ment Ho. No. 705-8 Mis F 18-06-10 dated 18th January
1909 in re the treatment of the temple Vritta
in Padavanakodu Village, Chamarajanagar
Taluk, as Devadaya Inam etc. I have
honor to state that as both Devadaya
Personal Vrittes are mixed up in the Inam
(whole Village), no separate title-deeds o
be issued to the Devadaya and Personal
Vrittes. One Title-deed containing all the
names has been already issued and is
with one of the party The Government Pro-
-ceedings has been noted in the Inam Register

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

D Rama Rao
Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

File No. 18/06
Serial No 13

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

4/4/1

No. 1604

General and Rev. Secretariat
( )
, the 190 .

To

The Superintendent of
Inam Settlements in Mysore

Sir,

Date of issue 15-4-09

Signed by Asst. Secy.
am directed to

With reference to your letter no 73, dated 11th march 1909, I ~~have the honour to~~ enquire whether, in order to safeguard the interests of the Sri Gowripatheswaraswamy temple at Konanur and prevent the alienation of the temple with it is not necessary that an extract from the Quit Rent Register revised in accordance with Govt Pro no 705-8 mwz 18-06-10, dated 18th January 1909, should be forwarded to the Deputy Commr: and a revised title deed also issued to the party for purposes of reference an Extract from the Revised

over.

Quit Rent Register may also be
forwarded to Govt in the
Dept.

Have &c,

Fair Dft)

By
12/4/09
for Secretary
~~Surv. Dept.~~
12/4/09

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

CPB—20,000-19-12—(

No. 86
Enc. 1

Office of the Superintendent of
Inam Settlements in Mysore,
Dated Bangalore, 6 May 1909.

DIARY NO. 1488



From
M. D. Thamma Rao, Esq.,
Superintendent of Inam Settlements
in Mysore, Bangalore.

To

Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl. and Rev. Depts

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 1604 / Inam 18-06 dated 15 April 1909 enquiring whether it is not necessary that an extract from the quit rent Register revised in accordance with Govt Pros No. 705-8 / Inam 18 06- dated 18 January 1909 should be forwd to the Deputy Commissioner to prevent the alienation of the temple with in Padara-Kodu S M village, Chamaraja nagar Taluk belonging to Sri Gowripatheswara Swamy and a revised title-deed issued to the party, I have the honor to State that

GPB—300—23 9 10

as the enjoyment of the temple and personal rights have not been Separately located and demarcated on the ground it is not possible to issue a fresh title-deed.

A copy of the revised final quit rent Register is, herewith, enclosed, as requested and another forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner for information.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Sd) D. Shama Rao
Superintendent of
Inam Settlements

"Copy"
Srikakulam,
31.3.1915. Asstt. Inam Settlt. Officer.

From

The Superintendent,
Inam Settlements
in Mysore.

To

The Secy. to the Govt. of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl. & Rev. Dept

Dated

Despatched

No.
Enc.

SUBJECT.

From

The Superintendent,
Inam Settlements
in Mysore.

To

The Secy. to the Govt. of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl. & Rev. Depts.

Dated

Despatched

No.
Enc.

SUBJECT.